

### Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/597,837 First Named Applicant: K. Donald Evans  
 Examiner: Douglas J. McGinty Art Unit: 1796 Status of Application: Pending

**Tentative Participants:**

(1) Douglas J. McGinty (2) Evan R. Witt  
 (3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: January 28, 2009 Proposed Time: 3 PM (AM/PM)

**Type of Interview Requested:**

(1)  Telephonic (2)  Personal (3)  Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [ ] YES [ ] NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(2) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(3) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
(4) _____	_____	_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
[ ] Continuation Sheet Attached					

**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**

Please see attached.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

/Evan R. Witt/  
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Douglas McGinty

Digitally signed by Douglas McGinty  
DN: cn=Douglas McGinty, o=US, o=Art Unit 1796,  
ou=USPTO, email=douglas.mcginity@uspto.gov  
Date: 2009-01-29 13:32:01 -05'00'

Examiner/SPE Signature

Evan R. Witt  
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

32,512  
Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2

Appl. No.	:	10/597,837	Confirmation No.: 6962
Applicant	:	K Donald Evans et al.	
Title	:	MULTIUSE, SOLID CLEANING DEVICE AND COMPOSITION	
Filed	:	August 9, 2006	
TC/A.U.	:	1796	
Examiner	:	Douglas J. McGinty	
Docket No.	:	14216.16	

Appl. No.	:	11/535,896	Confirmation No.: 8242
Applicant	:	K Donald Evans et al.	
Title	:	MULTIUSE, SOLID CLEANING DEVICE AND COMPOSITION	
Filed	:	September 27, 2006	
TC/A.U.	:	1796	
Examiner	:	Douglas J. McGinty	
Docket No.	:	14216.21	
Customer No.	:	21999	

#### Outline of Discussion Items for Examiner Interview:

##### ***Double Patenting***

Same Invention. Both applications were rejected under Section 101 under grounds of “same invention” double patenting. While the claims are similar, they are not identical. In application 10/597,837, the claims are drawn to a “method of providing *laundry* cleaning agent to a *laundry* cleaning machine.” In contrast, the claims of copending application 11/535,896 are drawn to a “method of providing cleaning agent to a cleaning machine.”

Obviousness-type. We suggest submitting a Terminal Disclaimer.

##### ***Section 103(a) Rejections***

Seepanski (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0006891) in view of Laughlin (U.S. Patent No. 5,342,587). The Office Action urges “In its *dissolved* state, the device is deposited within the laundry cleaning machine tub.” The Examiner seems to believe that this interpretation is consistent with the claim language which states: “obtaining a multiuse laundry cleaning device in a *solid* state” and “*depositing* the laundry cleaning device *within* the laundry cleaning machine tub under conditions such that the *laundry cleaning device is exposed to water from the plurality of laundry wash and rinse cycles.*”

Scepanski and Laughlin disclose external detergent dispensers. They do not disclose a multiuse cleaning device in solid state that is deposited within the cleaning machine such that the cleaning device is exposed to water from the plurality of wash and rinse cycles.

Dawson (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,733) in view of Scepanski. The Dawson patent discloses a receptacle for dispensing a solid cleaning tablet. Dawson teaches that two tablets are used for one washing operation. Col. 4, lines 20-21. When the washing operation has been completed, the receptacle is removed from the machine and stored for subsequent use. Col. 4, lines 26-27. It does not appear to disclose dispensing a substantially consistent quantity of cleaning agent over a plurality of laundry wash and rinse cycles – in other words, Dawson does not disclose a multiuse, solid cleaning device.

Another claim limitation that does not appear to be taught by the cited prior art is the feature that the multiuse cleaning device dissolves in water and releases a substantially consistent quantity of cleaning agent over a plurality of cleaning wash and rinse cycles. Claims 41-43 of application 11/535,896 define this feature in greater detail. Claim 48 of application 10/597,837 and claim 45 of application 11/535,896 recite that the cleaning agent in solid form dissolves and releases a substantially consistent quantity of cleaning agent over form 10 to 40 cleaning wash or rinse cycles.